

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 17-1774V

(Filed: October 2, 2018)

* * * * *	*	UNPUBLISHED
ESTON HOOD,	*	
	*	
Petitioner,	*	Special Master Roth
	*	
v.	*	Ruling on Entitlement; Table Injury;
	*	Influenza (“Flu”) Vaccine; Guillain-Barre
	*	Syndrome (“GBS”)
SECRETARY OF HEALTH	*	
AND HUMAN SERVICES,	*	
	*	
Respondent.	*	
	*	
* * * * *	*	

Ronald C. Homer, Esq., Conway, Homer, P.C., Boston, MA, for petitioner.

Ann D. Martin, Esq., U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On November 13, 2017, Eston Hood (“petitioner”) filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (“the Program”)² alleging that he received the influenza (“flu”) vaccine on October 31, 2014, and thereafter suffered from Guillain-Barre Syndrome (“GBS”). *See* Petition at 1.

On October 1, 2018, respondent filed a report pursuant to Vaccine Rule 4(c) stating that

¹ Although this Decision has been formally designated “unpublished,” it will nevertheless be posted on the Court of Federal Claims’s website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (codified as amended at 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2006)). **This means the Decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** However, the parties may object to the Decision’s inclusion of certain kinds of confidential information. Specifically, under Vaccine Rule 18(b), each party has fourteen days within which to request redaction “of any information furnished by that party: (1) that is a trade secret or commercial or financial in substance and is privileged or confidential; or (2) that includes medical files or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy.” Vaccine Rule 18(b). Otherwise, the whole Decision will be available to the public. *Id.*

² The Program comprises Part 2 of the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-10 *et seq.* (hereinafter “Vaccine Act” or “the Act”). Hereafter, individual section references will be to 42 U.S.C. § 300aa of the Act.

petitioner's claim was appropriate for compensation. Resp. Rpt., ECF No. 26 at 1. Specifically, respondent agrees with petitioner's claim that he suffered the Table injury of GBS following the flu vaccine. *Id.* at 5. Respondent further states that there is no preponderant evidence that petitioner's GBS was due to a factor unrelated to the vaccination. *Id.* Based on a review of the medical records, respondent states that petitioner has met the applicable statutory requirements by suffering his condition for more than six months and that, therefore, petitioner has satisfied all legal prerequisites for compensation under the Act. *Id.* Respondent requests that the scope of damages to be awarded be limited to petitioner's GBS and related sequelae only. *Id.*

A special master may determine whether a petitioner is entitled to compensation based upon the record. A hearing is not required. §300aa-13; Vaccine Rule 8(d). In light of respondent's concession and a review of the record, the undersigned finds that petitioner is entitled to compensation. This matter shall now proceed to the damages phase.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Mindy Michaels Roth

Mindy Michaels Roth

Special Master